

Session 11-01 A Regular Meeting of the 1% for the Arts Art Selection Committee was called to order at 1:05 pm on August 25, 2011 by Chair Michele Miller at City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

PRESENT: TODD STEINER, STEINER'S NORTH STAR CONSTRUCTION, INC. AS DESIGN REPRESENTATIVE; ANN MARIE HOLEN, SPECIAL PROJECTS COORDINATOR AS BUILDING DIRECTOR'S DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE; RICK ABBOD, CITY PLANNER REPRESENTING THE DEPARTMENTS; MICHELE MILLER, PUBLIC ARTS COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE; BRIANNA ALLEN, ARTIST AT LARGE

STAFF: RENEE KRAUSE, CMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK
CAREY MEYER, PROJECT MANAGER AND DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. Krause stated that a standard practice of the Clerk's Office is to request the first applicant for a new committee to act as chair until one is elected. Ms. Krause informed Ms. Miller that she was the first applicant for the committee and inquired if she would be acting chair to open the meeting. Ms. Miller accepted and called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Acting Chair Miller requested a motion to approve the agenda.

HOLEN/ALLEN – MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

There was no discussion or comments.

The agenda was approved by consensus of the Task Force.

PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING ITEMS ON THE AGENDA *(3 Minute Time Limit)*

There were no comments or questions on items on the agenda.

RECONSIDERATION

There were no items for reconsideration.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(Minutes are approved during regular meetings only)

There were no prior minutes for approval.

VISITORS

There were no visitors scheduled.

STAFF & COUNCIL REPORT/COMMITTEE REPORTS/BOROUGH REPORTS

(Chair set time limit not to exceed 5 minutes)

There was no staff reports included for this meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING *(3 minute time limit)*

There were no items for public hearing scheduled.

PENDING BUSINESS

There were no pending business items.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of a Chair and Vice Chair

Acting Chair Ms. Miller opened the floor for nominations for chair.

Ms. Holen nominated Michele Miller. This was seconded by Mr. Steiner.

There were no further nominations. The floor was closed for nominations.

Ms. Miller was unanimously voted for Chair of the Committee.

Chair Miller thanked the Committee and commented she likes running meetings.

Chair Miller opened the floor for nominations of Vice Chair.

Mr. Steiner nominated Ms. Allen for Vice Chair. Ms. Holen seconded the nomination.

Chair Miller closed floor for nominations.

The vote was unanimous electing Ms. Allen as Vice Chair. Ms. Allen thanked the members of the committee.

There was no further discussion.

Mr. Abboud arrived at the meeting at 11:11 p.m.

B. Requirements of the 1% for the Arts Program, Review and Discussion

1. Public Arts Committee Administrative Guidelines excerpt 1% for the Arts Program
2. State of Alaska Statute 35.27.010, Art Works in Public Buildings and Facilities
3. Homer City Code, Chapter 18.07 Funds for Works of Art in Public Places
4. Ordinance 02-25(A), Requiring Funding for Works of Art in projects for Construction, Remodeling and Renovation of Certain Public Facilities.

Chair Miller stated she did not review the materials in the packet and requested a synopsis from staff regarding the content or recommendation on what they should review and focus on right now. Staff recommended that the Committee review the enclosed materials but should focus on the duties of the Committee.

Chair Miller noted that the duties were on page 11 in the packet and that all process was to be handled confidentially. She further stated that the committee members should review the entire packet.

C. Establishing the Project Budget, Memorandum dated August 18, 2011

1. Excerpt from Contract Awarded to Steiner's North Star Construction, Inc.

Chair Miller confirmed with staff that the budget established is \$15,000.00 at this time.

D. Discussion and Recommendation for Placement of Art

1. Project Site Drawings

Chair Miller noted that there were previous recommendations for location and requested some clarification. Staff reported that at previous meetings the Public Arts Committee supported an outdoor piece and that the City Hall Renovation and Expansion Task Force additionally supported an outdoor art piece also.

Mr. Abboud commented on a proposed rain garden to be located in the area between the City Hall and the College. He offered a preference for a piece that could be used to sit take a break; offer a person the ability to reflect and view the surroundings, etc. He has a preference for a usable piece. He believes it was to be used as an example for the community. He would like to see something functional.

Chair Miller asked for clarification on what is a rain garden?

Mr. Steiner noted the location of the proposed rain garden is located on page 33 of the packet and that he was a bit unclear what the purpose of a rain garden was for and expressed confidence in Mr. Meyer being able to offer an explanation.

Mr. Meyer gave a description of what he believed the purpose and description of a rain garden was intended for and that the Soil and Water Conservation Society had received a grant; he confirmed that it was to be attractive not just functional. He did not have the specific grant information. It may be nice to have some benches around the location acting as a type of "pocket park". He noted that the Soil and Water Conservation Society wanted this to act as an exhibition/educational feature so the public can be aware that an effective and attractive alternative was available to deal with storm runoff.

Ms. Holen inquired if the proposed drawing should be included in the request for proposals. Discussion between the committee members concluded that they did not want to specifically choose this location but to possibly offer it as a location for public art. Mr. Abboud elaborated on his recommendation for the location as it would be a great location that would offer after hours use accessible to the college and general public too. Chair Miller stated if the Committee decided to include this area it could be included. Mr. Steiner commented that the area is already considered part of the college they are even mowing it currently. Mr. Meyer noted that it was a tight project and there is not a lot of open space on this job site. Mr. Steiner noted that there will be a new reception area available for interior art that should be considered.

Ms. Holen proposed the following language on page 39 Section II. Scope of Services, strike but is not limited to, and insert "other sites not listed may also be considered" before last sentence. She recommended clarification for the Central Green Space being notated as the "Rain Garden Area". Ms. Holen stated that she did not want to limit the areas and whether it is inside or outside.

Mr. Meyer noted that since this is after the design phase and they are currently in the construction phase it may be difficult to include a proposed artwork in the building structure at this stage. He commented that it was not unusual to hold a meeting where proposers may walk the site and have a question and answer period. He further responded that if an outdoor selection is made then there is no time limit but if an indoor piece that requires incorporation into the structure itself there is a very, very limited window of time. He elaborated that as long as the indoor piece is hanging on a wall there is time. He provided examples and noted that when it is the design phase the construction budget can accommodate some of the costs of the artwork.

Chair Miller informed the committee of past experiences working on the art committees in Anchorage and stated that while on both committees, one she was chair of, they selected the location. They decided on the locations to expedite the process. It would be up to this committee to decide on whether they want a lengthy or shorter process. Mr. Meyer informed the committee on the process performed for the Library artwork. Chair Miller inquired what was being asked of the proposer. Mr. Steiner recited the information from page 41. Ms. Miller commented that she would prefer new art specific to this building and site. According to the presented RFP template they could make a decision from the submitted proposals.

Mr. Steiner commented that if they leave it open as recommended by Ms. Holen then the committee has the opportunity to view all and quickly narrow it down to the top choices.

Chair Miller agreed with the open RFP but felt that it would be a longer time period because you had to allow the artists to visit every potential site to determine what they may propose. If a location is chosen then they only have to see one.

Mr. Meyer explained the process with the public library project. Ms. Holen noted that if three areas are offered then they may receive proposals that do not take up the whole \$15,000. Chair Miller disagreed stating they will have no problem spending the whole amount on one proposal. Mr. Steiner noted that there were limited sites to choose from for outside locations since the majority was parking lot. There would be four or five areas at most.

Chair Miller asked what the other suggested sites from the building committee or the architect. Mr. Abboud stated that the lobby areas, front of the building, rain garden area. A brief discussion on a proposal on a piece of furniture can be considered art and the council chambers should be considered since it is a public room. Mr. Steiner suggested he could go to his office and get a civil drawing and they could visit the site for possible locations.

Chair Miller recessed the meeting at 1:40 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 1:54 p.m.

Chair Miller noted that the committee walked through the site and noted four possible locations and would like to include those locations in the request for proposal. Mr. Steiner commented that a drawing highlighting the locations could be provided to include in the request for proposal documents.

HOLEN/ABBOUD-MOVED THAT THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL INCLUDE AT LEAST TWO DRAWINGS HIGHLIGHTING THE FOUR AREAS AS MOST LIKELY SITES FOR PUBLIC ART.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Miller inquired how these locations would be described in the request for proposal. Mr. Steiner responded that it was recommended to hold a site visit for the proposers and this can be included in the request for proposal. Ms. Allen agreed that it would be very beneficial. Chair Miller inquired if there was any code against restricting it to local artists she provided an example of an interested artist from Fairbanks not being able to make the onsite visit. She wanted to flesh out the request for proposal as much as possible to be able to provide a visual and a description so that those who could not attend a site visit would have as much information as if attending a site visit so all proposers were on the same level.

There was a brief discussion on limiting the judging on the content of the proposals not whether they were from Homer or not. Mr. Meyer explained that if equal proposals were received one from New York and one from a local artist it can be assumed that the local artist would be chosen. He explained that the City has a Bidders Preference and that relates to paying up to 5% more for a service from a local preference to keep business here in Homer. He was not sure that this could be applied to this particular request for proposal.

Chair Miller stated that they should make a motion for the request for proposal to give staff the language to draft it. The template request for proposal was good but should contain the language that Ms. Holen recommended and that the locations the Committee agreed on should be listed. Mr. Steiner inquired about the four sites just to clarify. Chair Miller noted that the location of the rain garden, south of the spruce tree in front of the college, the green space just south of the new wall of the new building; the area on the north side of the spruce tree to the left of the sidewalk; the area over the culvert; the area where the existing ADA ramp is; the entryway into the new building; the new meeting space; the entrance to the downstairs lobby and lobby area. Mr. Meyer suggested that the building and site drawings be included with the areas identified and it noted that it is not limited to these areas.

Further discussion on clarity of recommended locations and if it should be limited at all, just indicate the obvious locations on the site and that it is open to all suggestions.

HOLEN/ABBOUD - MOVED TO AMEND THE PREVIOUS MOTION STRIKING "FOUR SITES" AND INSTEAD INDICATING SUGGESTED LOCATIONS.

Mr. Steiner clarified that to aid staff in drafting the request for proposal document to notate that drawings will be provided with the suggested locations both interior and exterior and proposers are welcome to include alternate locations if they choose to do so.

Chair asked the maker of the motion if she would accept this as a friendly amendment. The friendly amendment was accepted by the maker of the motion and second.

MOVED TO AMEND THE PREVIOUS MOTION BY STRIKING THE LANGUAGE "AT LEAST TWO DRAWINGS HIGHLIGHTING THE FOUR AREAS AS MOST LIKELY SITES FOR PUBLIC ART"

THE AMENDED MOTION READ:

HOLEN/ABBOUD-MOVED THAT THE PROPOSERS WILL BE PROVIDED WITH DRAWINGS INDICATING THE SUGGESTED LOCATIONS BOTH INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR AND PROPOSERS ARE WELCOME TO INCLUDE ALTERNATE LOCATIONS IF THEY CHOOSE TO DO SO.

There was no discussion.

The amended motion was approved by consensus of the committee.

- E. Review, Discussion and Recommendation on Draft Request for Proposal Documents
 - 1. Draft Advertisement
 - 2. Draft Request for Proposal
 - 3. Draft RFP Scoring Form

Chair inquired if staff needed additional direction to draft the request for proposal. Staff responded that as long as the time schedule and the remaining information such as the scoring form and questions were approved there was nothing further required.

Mr. Abboud requested clarification on how the scoring was executed. Chair Miller inquired what sources were used for the scoring form.

Staff explained that the list of questions shown on pages 42 and 43 of the packet as criteria the proposals received could be reviewed with and the questions on the scoring form were the same for draft purposes. This information was gathered from a variety of sources. Staff stated it was up to the committee to determine whether they wanted to include all, some or none of the information provided in the draft request for proposal. Staff agreed that some questions said the same thing but were worded differently.

Mr. Steiner was concerned that if the scoring sheet was included in the documents then proposers would be getting hung up on the points they would be getting. He believed that there was a parameter being set and did not feel it was necessary for the score sheet to be distributed to the proposers.

Chair Miller interjected her opinion that she approved of including the guidelines in the documents but agreed the scoring sheet did not need to be included and in fact the committee could come up with their own scoring sheet and it did not have to be done today, but that it could be a simplified scoring sheet; unless the draft was called for she believed the evaluation guidelines explained to the artists what they were looking for.

Ms. Holen commented that the point Mr. Steiner was making was well taken that the scoring exercise was unnecessary and that her experience with scoring sheets most people know what they want so they would score high the proposals they wanted. She noted some questions were valid such as durable, vandalism issues, etc. Mr. Abboud agreed.

Chair Miller stated that scoring sheets served a purpose and was a good method to note a reviewers comments, impressions, etc., about individual proposals received. However, if they only received a couple of proposals then a scoring sheet may not be needed.

Mr. Steiner inquired if it was staff's intent to send out the scoring sheet with the request for proposal. Staff responded that it was a separate document and it was up to the committee if they wanted the scoring sheet included. Staff's intent was to provide a document similar to what had been provided on previous request for proposals for the benefit of the committee.

Mr. Steiner liked the idea of including the evaluation questions and wanted to separate the two issues. It was again noted on separate occasions that the questions were the same in the evaluation criteria and scoring sheet.

STEINER/ABBOUD – MOVED TO INCLUDE THE QUESTIONS ON PAGES 42 AND 43 OF THE PACKET IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL UNDER EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE ARTIST TO USE IN PREPARATION OF THEIR PROPOSAL BUT NOT REPRESENTED AS A SCORING SHEET IN THE PROPOSAL DOCUMENTS.

There was a brief discussion on the inclusion of the questions under the evaluation criteria and removal of the Scoring Sheet from the proposal documents. Staff further explained that the scoring was based on a system of points. Staff used 100 points total in the draft; the proposer(s) would be selected or narrowed by who got the most points. A sampling of the valuation of the points was shown at the top of the form. Staff provided an example such as if they felt the proposal they were reviewing had not addressed the criteria then a point value

of zero would be given and if the proposal being reviewed provided substantial applicability then they could award 30 points. It was noted that each reviewer would be inexplicably adding in their preference for the proposals when reviewing. That was unavoidable, it is human nature. She explained that the scoring form was used on past proposals. The questions on the scoring sheet and in the evaluation criteria were the same as it was up to the committee on what to include in each section. It is submitted as suggestions and recommendation of what was done previously by the City. Staff stressed that it is up to the committee what questions to use.

VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Miller directed the committee to the anticipated project dates or timeline schedule as proposed. She noted the dates under advertisement and with the newspapers noted in parentheses. She commented that she was not aware of what the budget was for advertising and if news media was the only avenue or if radio was used too.

Mr. Abboud commented on the type of advertising the Planning Commission does by notices in the paper, KBBI and through the kiosks. The arts community and state has an email tree, it was noted that the Homer Council on the Arts has a newsletter. Chair Miller requested confirmation on advertisement methods from staff.

Staff responded that they normally advertise for two successive weeks in a local paper and then once in either the Clarion or Anchorage paper. They will also note the due date of the request for proposals on the weekly Clerk's radio report. It was determined that it could be advertised via the email tree and blog and a local newspaper. Staff can distribute the emails if the Chair will forward that information.

Chair Miller then requested the Committee to review the remaining timeline. She noted that this went hand in hand with the meeting schedule and did not feel that it could be met. She was concerned that they could accomplish everything involved in 1-1.5 hours twice a month. She was unable to expend an hour and a half in the middle of the day with her work schedule. She stated that the committee really needs to think about this. Ms. Holen asked for what reason would they have to hold the next meeting.

Ms. Allen would like the time to fully read the information from end to end and then come back to hash out what they need to do and after the next meeting they would have a better sense of direction. This was a lot to take in at once.

Discussion ensued on whether they should schedule another meeting allowing committee members time to read all the information contained in the packet and assimilate the proposed timeline into their own personal schedules.

ALLEN/HOLEN - MOVED TO SCHEDULE ADDITIONAL MEETING PRIOR TO THE PROPOSED NOVEMBER 9, 2011 MEETING.

Discussion on the dates to schedule the next meeting and the possibility of postponing the whole process as outlined in the draft timeline. It was agreed that September 6, 2011 at 1:00 p.m. Tuesday would work for everyone.

VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Mr. Steiner stated that the two sheets will be provided at the next meeting so that can be hashed out and completed at that meeting. Ms. Allen suggested that they think about including photos in the request for proposal on the proposed or suggested locations. Mr. Abboud recommended discussing this with staff regarding possible copy issues such as clarity of the photos.

F. Discuss and Establish a Meeting Schedule

Mr. Abboud commented that they have been already talking about that in a sense. He expounded on the abilities of staff to produce a meeting schedule in accordance to the advertising requirements.

ABBOUD/ALLEN - MOVED TO POSTPONE THE MEETING SCHEDULE TO THE NEXT MEETING.

There was a brief discussion on postponing setting the meeting schedule to the next meeting.

VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION UNANIMOUS. CONSENT.

Motion carried.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

There were no informational materials in the packet.

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

There were no audience members present.

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

There were no comments from city staff.

COMMENTS OF THE CHAIR

None.

COMMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE

None.

ADJOURN

There being no further business before the Art Selection Committee Chair Miller adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m. The next Regular Meeting will on Tuesday September 6, 2011 at 1:00 p.m. at City Hall, Cowles Council Chambers, 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

Renee Krause, CMC, Deputy City Clerk I

Approved: _____